

A Las Vegas approximation algorithm for metric 1-median selection

Ching-Lueh Chang ^{*†}

February 28, 2017

Abstract

Given an n -point metric space, consider the problem of finding a point with the minimum sum of distances to all points. We show that this problem has a randomized algorithm that *always* outputs a $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximate solution in an expected $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time for each constant $\epsilon > 0$. Inheriting Indyk's [9] algorithm, our algorithm outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median in $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time with probability $\Omega(1)$.

1 Introduction

A metric space is a nonempty set M endowed with a metric, i.e., a function $d: M \times M \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ such that

- $d(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$ (identity of indiscernibles),
- $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$ (symmetry), and
- $d(x, y) + d(y, z) \geq d(x, z)$ (triangle inequality)

for all $x, y, z \in M$ [13].

For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, define $[n] \equiv \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. Given $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and oracle access to a metric $d: [n] \times [n] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, METRIC 1-MEDIAN asks for $\operatorname{argmin}_{y \in [n]} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x)$, breaking ties arbitrarily. It generalizes the classical median selection on the real line and has a brute-force $\Theta(n^2)$ -time algorithm. More generally, METRIC k -MEDIAN asks for $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k \in [n]$ minimizing $\sum_{x \in [n]} \min_{i=1}^k d(x, c_i)$. Because $d(\cdot, \cdot)$ defines $\binom{n}{2} = \Theta(n^2)$ nonzero distances, only $o(n^2)$ -time algorithms are said

^{*}Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Yuan Ze University, Taoyuan, Taiwan.
Email: clchang@saturn.yzu.edu.tw

[†]Supported in part by the Ministry of Science and Technology of Taiwan under grant 105-2221-E-155-047-.

to run in sublinear time [8]. For all $\alpha \geq 1$, an α -approximate 1-median is a point $p \in [n]$ satisfying

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(p, x) \leq \alpha \cdot \min_{y \in [n]} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x).$$

For all $\epsilon > 0$, METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a Monte Carlo $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ -time algorithm [8, 9]. Guha et al. [7] show that METRIC k -MEDIAN has a Monte Carlo, $O(\exp(O(1/\epsilon)))$ -approximation, $O(nk \log n)$ -time, $O(n^\epsilon)$ -space and one-pass algorithm for all small k as well as a deterministic, $O(\exp(O(1/\epsilon)))$ -approximation, $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$ -time, $O(n^\epsilon)$ -space and one-pass algorithm. Given n points in $\mathbb{R}^D$ with $D \geq 1$, the Monte Carlo algorithms of Kumar et al. [10] find a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median in $O(D \cdot \exp(1/\epsilon^{O(1)}))$ time and a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate solution to METRIC k -MEDIAN in $O(Dn \cdot \exp((k/\epsilon)^{O(1)}))$ time. All randomized $O(1)$ -approximation algorithms for METRIC k -MEDIAN take $\Omega(nk)$ time [7, 11]. Chang [2] shows that METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a deterministic, $(2h)$ -approximation, $O(hn^{1+1/h})$ -time and nonadaptive algorithm for all constants $h \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus \{1\}$, generalizing the results of Chang [1] and Wu [15]. On the other hand, he disproves the existence of deterministic $(2h - \epsilon)$ -approximation $O(n^{1+1/(h-1)}/h)$ -time algorithms for all constants $h \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \setminus \{1\}$ and $\epsilon > 0$ [3, 4].

In social network analysis, the closeness centrality of a point v is the reciprocal of the average distance from v to all points [14]. So METRIC 1-MEDIAN asks for a point with the maximum closeness centrality. Given oracle access to a graph metric, the Monte-Carlo algorithms of Goldreich and Ron [6] and Eppstein and Wang [5] estimate the closeness centrality of a given point and those of all points, respectively.

All known sublinear-time algorithms for METRIC 1-MEDIAN are either deterministic or Monte Carlo, the latter having a positive probability of failure. For example, Indyk's Monte Carlo $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm outputs with a positive probability a solution without approximation guarantees. In contrast, we show that METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a randomized algorithm that *always* outputs a $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximate solution in expected $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time for all constants $\epsilon > 0$. So, excluding the known deterministic algorithms (which are Las Vegas only in the degenerate sense), this paper gives the *first* Las Vegas approximation algorithm for METRIC 1-MEDIAN with an expected sublinear running time. Note that deterministic sublinear-time algorithms for METRIC 1-MEDIAN can be 4 -approximate but not $(4 - \epsilon)$ -approximate for any constant $\epsilon > 0$ [1, 4]. So our approximation ratio of $2 + \epsilon$ beats that of any deterministic sublinear-time algorithm. Inheriting Indyk's algorithm, our algorithm outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median in $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time with probability $\Omega(1)$ for all constants $\epsilon > 0$.

Below is our high-level and inaccurate sketch of proof, where $\epsilon, \delta > 0$ are small constants:

- (i) Run Indyk's algorithm to find a probably $(1 + \epsilon/10^{10})$ -approximate 1-median, z . Then let $r = \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x)/n$ be the average distance from z to all points.

- (ii) For all $R > 0$, denote by $B(z, R)$ the open ball with center z and radius R . Use the triangle inequality (with details omitted here) to show z to be a solution no worse than the points in $[n] \setminus B(z, 8r)$, i.e.,

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x) \leq \inf_{y \in [n] \setminus B(z, 8r)} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x). \quad (1)$$

- (iii) Take a uniformly random bijection $\pi: [|B(z, \delta nr)|] \rightarrow B(z, \delta nr)$. Then observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{y \in B(z, 8r)} \sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(y, x) &\geq \min_{y \in B(z, 8r)} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} (d(y, \pi(2i-1)) + d(y, \pi(2i))) \quad (2) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)), \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

where the first (resp., second) inequality follows from the injectivity of π (resp., the triangle inequality).

- (iv) Assume $B(z, \delta nr) = [n]$ for simplicity. So by inequalities (1)–(3), if the following inequality holds, then it serves as a witness that z is $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximate:

$$\sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z, x) \leq (2 + \epsilon) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)). \quad (4)$$

¹ To guarantee outputting a $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median, output z only when inequality (4) holds. Restart from item (i) whenever inequality (4) is false.

More details of item (iv) follow: For a 1-median z' of $B(z, \delta nr)$, it will be easy to show

$$\sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', x) \leq (2 + o(1)) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right]. \quad (5)$$

² When z in item (i) is indeed $(1 + \epsilon/10^{10})$ -approximate,

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{10^{10}}\right) \cdot \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z', x). \quad (6)$$

¹Assuming $B(z, \delta nr) = [n]$, inequalities (2)–(4) imply $\sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x) \leq (2 + \epsilon) \cdot \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x)$ for all $y \in B(z, 8r)$. Furthermore, $\sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x) \leq \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x)$ for all $y \in [n] \setminus B(z, 8r)$ by inequality (1).

²Though not directly stated in later sections, this is a consequence of Lemmas 7 and 12 in Sec. 4.

Assuming $B(z, \delta nr) = [n]$, inequalities (5)–(6) make inequality (4) hold with high probability as long as $\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i))$ is highly concentrated around its expectation. The need for such concentration is why we restrict the radius of the codomain of π to be δnr in item (iii)—Large distances ruin concentration bounds. To accommodate for the points in $[n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)$, our witness for the approximation ratio of z actually differs slightly from inequality (4), unlike in item (iv).³

2 Definitions and preliminaries

For a metric space $([n], d)$, $x \in [n]$ and $R > 0$, define

$$B(x, R) \equiv \{y \in [n] \mid d(x, y) < R\}$$

to be the open ball with center x and radius R . For brevity,

$$B^2(x, R) \equiv B(x, R) \times B(x, R).$$

The pairs in $B^2(x, R)$ are ordered.

An algorithm A with oracle access to $d: [n] \times [n] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is denoted by A^d and may query d on any $(x, y) \in [n] \times [n]$ for $d(x, y)$. In this paper, all Landau symbols (such as $O(\cdot)$, $o(\cdot)$, $\Theta(\cdot)$ and $\Omega(\cdot)$) are w.r.t. n . The following result is due to Indyk.

Fact 1 ([8, 9]). *For all $\epsilon > 0$, METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a Monte Carlo $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximation $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ -time algorithm with a failure probability of at most $1/e$.*

Henceforth, denote Indyk’s algorithm in Fact 1 by **Indyk median**. It is given $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\epsilon > 0$ and oracle access to a metric $d: [n] \times [n] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. By convention, denote the expected value and the variance of a random variable X by $\mathbb{E}[X]$ and $\text{var}(X)$, respectively.

Chebyshev’s inequality ([12]). *Let X be a random variable with a finite expected value and a finite nonzero variance. Then for all $k \geq 1$,*

$$\Pr \left[|X - \mathbb{E}[X]| \geq k\sqrt{\text{var}(X)} \right] \leq \frac{1}{k^2}.$$

3 Algorithm and approximation ratio

Throughout this paper, take any small constant $\epsilon > 0$, e.g., $\epsilon = 10^{-100}$. By line 1 of **Las Vegas median** in Fig. 1, $\delta > 0$ is likewise a small constant. The following lemma implies that z in line 3 of **Las Vegas median** is a solution (to METRIC 1-MEDIAN) no worse than those in $[n] \setminus B(z, 8r)$, where r is as in line 4.

³Our witness for the approximation ratio of z is as in line 6 of **Las Vegas median** in Fig. 1.

```

1: Find  $\delta > 0$  such that  $2 + \epsilon = 2/(1 - 100\sqrt{\delta})$ ;
2: while true do
3:    $z \leftarrow \text{Indyk median}^d(n, \epsilon/10^{10})$ ;
4:    $r \leftarrow \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x)/n$ ;
5:   Pick a uniformly random bijection  $\pi: [|B(z, \delta nr)|] \rightarrow B(z, \delta nr)$ ;
6:   if  $\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r) \geq (1 - 100\sqrt{\delta})nr/2$  then
7:     return  $z$ ;
8:   end if
9: end while

```

Figure 1: Algorithm **Las Vegas median** with oracle access to a metric $d: [n] \times [n] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and with inputs $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and a small constant $\epsilon > 0$

Lemma 2. *In each iteration of the **while** loop of **Las Vegas median**,*

$$\inf_{y \in [n] \setminus B(z, 8r)} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x) \geq 7 \cdot \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x).$$

Proof. For each $y \in [n] \setminus B(z, 8r)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x) &\geq \sum_{x \in [n]} (d(y, z) - d(z, x)) \\
&\geq \sum_{x \in [n]} (8r - d(z, x)) \\
&= 8nr - \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x) \\
&= 7 \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality, the second follows from $y \notin B(z, 8r)$ and the last equality follows from line 4 of **Las Vegas median**. $\square$

Lemma 3. *When line 7 of **Las Vegas median** is run,*

$$\min_{y \in B(z, 8r)} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x) \geq \frac{1 - 100\sqrt{\delta}}{2} \cdot \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x).$$

Proof. Pick any $y \in B(z, 8r)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(y, x) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} (d(y, \pi(2i-1)) + d(y, \pi(2i))) \\
&\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)),
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the first and the second inequalities follow from the injectivity of π in line 5 of **Las Vegas median** and the triangle inequality, respectively.⁴ Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} d(y, x) &\geq \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - d(y, z)) \\ &\geq \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the first and the second inequalities follow from the triangle inequality and $y \in B(z, 8r)$, respectively. Summing up inequalities (7)–(8),

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r).$$

This and lines 6–7 of **Las Vegas median** imply

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x) \geq \frac{1 - 100\sqrt{\delta}}{2} \cdot nr$$

when line 7 is run. Finally, $nr = \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x)$ by line 4. $\square$

Lemmas 2–3 and line 1 of **Las Vegas median** yield the following.

Lemma 4. *When line 7 of **Las Vegas median** is run,*

$$(2 + \epsilon) \cdot \min_{y \in [n]} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x) \geq \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x),$$

i.e., z is a $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median.

By Lemma 4, **Las Vegas median** outputs a $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median at termination.

4 Probability of termination in any iteration

This section analyzes the probability of running line 7 in any particular iteration of the **while** loop of **Las Vegas median**. The following lemma uses an easy averaging argument.

Lemma 5.

$$|[n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)| \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$$

and, therefore,

$$|B(z, \delta nr)| \geq n - \frac{1}{\delta} = (1 - o(1))n.$$

⁴Note that $\pi(1), \pi(2), \dots, \pi(2 \lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor)$ are distinct elements of $B(z, \delta nr)$.

Proof. Clearly,

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x) \geq \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} d(z, x) \geq \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} \delta nr = |[n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot \delta nr.$$

Then use line 4 of **Las Vegas median**. $\square$

Henceforth, assume $n \geq 1/\delta + 4$ without loss of generality; otherwise, find a 1-median by brute force. So $|B(z, \delta nr)| \geq 4$ by Lemma 5. Define

$$r' \equiv \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2} \cdot \sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \quad (9)$$

to be the average distance in $B(z, \delta nr)$.

Lemma 6. $r' \leq 2r$.

Proof. By equation (9) and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} r' &\leq \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2} \cdot \sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, u) + d(z, v)) \\ &= \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2} \cdot |B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot \left(\sum_{u \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z, u) + \sum_{v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z, v) \right) \\ &= \frac{2}{|B(z, \delta nr)|} \cdot \sum_{u \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z, u). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Obviously, the average distance from z to the points in $B(z, \delta nr)$ is at most that from z to all points, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)|} \cdot \sum_{u \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z, u) \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \sum_{u \in [n]} d(z, u). \quad (11)$$

Inequalities (10)–(11) and line 4 of **Las Vegas median** complete the proof. $\square$

To analyze the probability that the condition in line 6 of **Las Vegas median** holds, we shall derive a concentration bound for

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)),$$

whose expected value and variance are examined in the next four lemmas.

Lemma 7. *With expectations taken over π ,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right] = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 \pm o(1)) nr'. \quad (12)$$

Proof. For each $i \in [\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor]$, $\{\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)\}$ is a uniformly random size-2 subset of $B(z, \delta nr)$ by line 5 of **Las Vegas median**. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i))] &= \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{\text{distinct } u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \quad (13) \\ &= \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) r', \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the second (resp., last) equality follows from the identity of indiscernibles (resp., equation (9) and Lemma 5). Finally, use equations (13)–(14), the linearity of expectation and Lemma 5. $\square$

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right)^2 \right] \quad (15) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2j-1), \pi(2j)) \right] \\ &= \sum_{\text{distinct } i, j=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \cdot d(\pi(2j-1), \pi(2j))] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[d^2(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i))], \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where the last equality follows from the linearity of expectation and the separation of pairs (i, j) according to whether $i = j$.

Lemma 8. *With expectations taken over π ,*

$$\sum_{\text{distinct } i, j=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} \mathbb{E}[d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \cdot d(\pi(2j-1), \pi(2j))] \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot (1 + o(1)) n^2 (r')^2.$$

Proof. Pick any distinct $i, j \in [\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor]$. By line 5 of **Las Vegas median**,

$$\{\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i), \pi(2j-1), \pi(2j)\}$$

is a uniformly random size-4 subset of $B(z, \delta nr)$. So

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \cdot d(\pi(2j-1), \pi(2j))] \\ &= \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1) \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 2) \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 3)} \\ &\quad \cdot \sum_{\text{distinct } u, v, x, y \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \cdot d(x, y). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\text{distinct } u, v, x, y \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \cdot d(x, y) &\leq \sum_{u, v, x, y \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \cdot d(x, y) \\
&= \sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \cdot \sum_{x, y \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(x, y) \\
&= \left(\sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{1 \leq i, j \leq \lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor \\ \text{distinct } i, j}} \mathbb{E} [d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \cdot d(\pi(2j-1), \pi(2j))] \\
&\leq \left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right\rfloor \left(\left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right\rfloor - 1 \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1) \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 2) \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 3)} \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \right)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Together with Lemma 5 and equation (9), this completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 9. *With expectations taken over π ,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} \mathbb{E} [d^2(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i))] \leq (1 + o(1)) (\delta n^2 r r' + 2\delta^2 n r^2). \quad (17)$$

Proof. By line 5 of Las Vegas median, $\{\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)\}$ is a uniformly random size-2 subset of $B(z, \delta nr)$ for each $i \in [1, \lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} \mathbb{E} [d^2(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i))] \quad (18) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{\text{distinct } u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d^2(u, v) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d^2(u, v) \\
&= \left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d^2(u, v).
\end{aligned}$$

For all $u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)$,

$$d(u, v) \leq d(z, u) + d(z, v) \leq \delta nr + \delta nr = 2\delta nr, \quad (19)$$

where the first inequality follows from the triangle inequality.

By equations (9) and (18)–(19), the left-hand side of inequality (17) cannot exceed the optimal value of the following problem, called MAX SQUARE SUM:

Find $d_{u,v} \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)$ to maximize

$$\left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d_{u,v}^2 \quad (20)$$

subject to

$$\frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2} \cdot \sum_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d_{u,v} = r', \quad (21)$$

$$\forall u, v \in B(z, \delta nr), \quad 0 \leq d_{u,v} \leq 2\delta nr. \quad (22)$$

Above, constraint (21) (resp., (22)) mimics equation (9) (resp., inequality (19) and the non-negativeness of distances). Appendix A bounds the optimal value of MAX SQUARE SUM from above by

$$\left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \left(\left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2 r'}{2\delta nr} \right\rfloor + 1 \right) \cdot (2\delta nr)^2.$$

This evaluates to be at most $(1 + o(1))(\delta n^2 r r' + 2\delta^2 n r^2)$ by Lemma 5. $\square$

Recall that the variance of any random variable X equals $\mathbb{E}[X^2] - (\mathbb{E}[X])^2$.

Lemma 10. *With variances taken over π ,*

$$\text{var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right) \leq 2(1 + o(1)) \delta n^2 r^2.$$

Proof. By equations (15)–(16) and Lemmas 8–9,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{4} \cdot (1 + o(1)) n^2 (r')^2 + (1 + o(1)) (\delta n^2 r r' + 2\delta^2 n r^2).$$

This and Lemma 7 imply

$$\text{var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right) \leq o(1) \cdot n^2 (r')^2 + (1 + o(1)) (\delta n^2 r r' + 2\delta^2 n r^2).$$

Finally, invoke Lemma 6. $\square$

Lemma 11. For all $k > 1$,

$$\Pr \left[\left| \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 \pm o(1)) nr' \right| \geq k \sqrt{2(1+o(1)) \delta nr} \right] \leq \frac{1}{k^2},$$

where the probability is taken over π .

Proof. Use Chebyshev's inequality and Lemmas 7 and 10. $\square$

Let $z' \in B(z, \delta nr)$ be a 1-median of $B(z, \delta nr)$, i.e.,

$$z' = \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in B(z, \delta nr)} \sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(y, x),$$

breaking ties arbitrarily. So by the averaging argument,

$$\sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', x) \leq \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)|} \cdot \sum_{y \in B(z, \delta nr)} \sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(y, x). \quad (23)$$

Lemma 12.

$$\sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', x) \leq nr'.$$

Proof. We have

$$\sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', x) \stackrel{(23)}{\leq} \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)|} \cdot \sum_{u, v \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(u, v) \stackrel{(9)}{=} |B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot r'.$$

Clearly, $|B(z, \delta nr)| \leq n$. $\square$

Lemma 13. For all sufficiently large n ,

$$d(z', z) \leq 8r.$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', x) &\geq \sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z', z) - d(z, x)) \\ &\geq \sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', z) - \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x) \\ &= \left(\sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', z) \right) - nr \\ &= |B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot d(z', z) - nr, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where the first inequality (resp., the first equality) follows from the triangle inequality (resp., line 4 of **Las Vegas median**). By Lemmas 6 and 12,

$$\sum_{x \in B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', x) \leq 2nr. \quad (25)$$

By inequalities (24)–(25) and Lemma 5, $d(z', z) \leq (3 + o(1))r$.⁵ □

Lemma 14. *For all sufficiently large n ,*

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(z', x) \leq nr' + \frac{16r}{\delta} + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r).$$

Proof. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} d(z', x) &\leq \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z', z) + d(z, x)) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 13}}{\leq} \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (8r + d(z, x)) \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 5}}{\leq} \frac{16r}{\delta} + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r). \end{aligned}$$

Now sum up the above with the inequality in Lemma 12. □

Lemma 15. *For all sufficiently large n and with probability greater than $1/2$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r) \geq \frac{1 - 100\sqrt{\delta}}{2} \cdot nr, \quad (26)$$

where the probability is taken over π and the internal coin tosses of **Indyk median** in line 3 of **Las Vegas median**.

Proof. By Lemma 11 with $k = 5$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) > \frac{1}{2} \cdot (1 \pm o(1)) nr' - 5\sqrt{2(1 + o(1))\delta} nr \quad (27)$$

with probability at least $1 - 1/25$. By Fact 1 and line 3 of **Las Vegas median**,

$$\sum_{x \in [n]} d(z, x) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{10^{10}}\right) \cdot \min_{y \in [n]} \sum_{x \in [n]} d(y, x) \quad (28)$$

$$\leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{10^{10}}\right) \cdot \sum_{x \in [n]} d(z', x) \quad (29)$$

⁵In fact, this is stronger than the lemma to be proved.

with probability at least $1 - 1/e$. Now by the union bound, inequalities (27)–(29) hold simultaneously with probability at least $1 - 1/25 - 1/e > 1/2$. It remains to derive inequality (26) from inequalities (27)–(29) for all sufficiently large n .

Line 4 of **Las Vegas median**, inequalities (28)–(29) and Lemma 14 give

$$nr \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{10^{10}}\right) \left(nr' + \frac{16r}{\delta} + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r) \right). \quad (30)$$

This and inequality (27) imply

$$\begin{aligned} & nr \\ & \leq \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{10^{10}}\right) \left(2(1 \pm o(1)) \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right) + 5\sqrt{2(1+o(1))\delta nr} \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{16r}{\delta} + \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

⁶ Clearly, $16r/\delta \leq 0.01 \cdot \sqrt{\delta nr}$ for all sufficiently large n . So inequality (31) implies, for all sufficiently large n and after laborious calculations,

$$\begin{aligned} & nr - \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{10^{10}}\right) 11\sqrt{2(1+o(1))\delta nr} \\ & \leq \left(2 + \frac{2\epsilon}{10^{10}}\right) (1+o(1)) \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) + \left(1 + \frac{\epsilon}{10^{10}}\right) \cdot \sum_{x \in [n] \setminus B(z, \delta nr)} (d(z, x) - 8r). \end{aligned}$$

This implies inequality (26) for all sufficiently large n (note that $\epsilon/10^{10} < \sqrt{\delta}$ by line 1 of **Las Vegas Median**).⁷ $\square$

Lemma 15 and lines 6–7 of **Las Vegas median** show the probability of termination in any iteration to be $\Omega(1)$. Because the proof of Lemma 15 implies that inequalities (26)–(29) hold simultaneously with probability $\Omega(1)$ in any iteration of **Las Vegas median**, it happens with probability $\Omega(1)$ that in the first iteration, z is returned in line 7 (because of inequality (26)) and is $(1 + \epsilon/10^{10})$ -approximate (because of inequality (28)). So **Las Vegas median** outputs a $(1 + \epsilon/10^{10})$ -approximate 1-median with probability $\Omega(1)$ in the first iteration. In summary, we have the following.

⁶To see this, rewrite inequality (27) as

$$nr' < 2(1 \pm o(1)) \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i)) \right) + 5\sqrt{2(1+o(1))\delta nr} \right].$$

⁷Divide both sides by $(2 + 2\epsilon/10^{10})(1 + o(1))$ so that the coefficient before $\sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor |B(z, \delta nr)|/2 \rfloor} d(\pi(2i-1), \pi(2i))$ becomes 1 in the right-hand side. Then verify the left-hand side (which is now $(nr - (1 + \epsilon/10^{10})11\sqrt{2(1+o(1))\delta nr}) / ((2 + 2\epsilon/10^{10})(1 + o(1)))$) to be at least $(1 - 100\sqrt{\delta})nr/2$ for all sufficiently large n .

Lemma 16. *The first iteration of the **while** loop of Las Vegas median outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median with probability $\Omega(1)$.*

5 Putting things together

We now show that METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a Las Vegas $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximation algorithm with an expected $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ running time for all constants $\epsilon > 0$. Our algorithm also outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median in time $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ with probability $\Omega(1)$.

Theorem 17. *For each constant $\epsilon > 0$, METRIC 1-MEDIAN has a randomized algorithm that (1) always outputs a $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximate solution in an expected $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time and that (2) outputs a $(1 + \epsilon)$ -approximate solution in time $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ with probability $\Omega(1)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4, Las Vegas median outputs a $(2 + \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median at termination. To prevent Las Vegas median from running forever, find a 1-median by brute force (which obviously takes $O(n^2)$ time) after n^2 steps of computation.

By Fact 1, line 3 of Las Vegas median takes $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time. Line 5 takes time $O(|B(z, \delta nr)|) = O(n)$ by the Knuth shuffle. Clearly, the other lines also take $O(n)$ time. Consequently, each iteration of the **while** loop of Las Vegas median takes $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time. By Lemma 15 and lines 6–7, Las Vegas median runs for at most $1/\Omega(1) = O(1)$ iterations in expectation. So its expected running time is $O(1) \cdot O(n/\epsilon^2) = O(n/\epsilon^2)$.

Having shown each iteration of Las Vegas median to take $O(n/\epsilon^2)$ time, establish condition (2) of the theorem with Lemma 16. $\square$

By Fact 1, Indyk median satisfies condition (2) in Theorem 17. But it does not satisfy condition (1).

We briefly justify the optimality of the ratio of $2 + \epsilon$ in Theorem 17. Let A be a randomized algorithm that always outputs a $(2 - \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median. Furthermore, denote by $p \in [n]$ (resp., $Q \subseteq [n] \times [n]$) the output (resp., the set of queries as unordered pairs) of $A^{d_1}(n)$, where d_1 is the discrete metric (i.e., $d_1(x, y) = 1$ and $d_1(x, x) = 0$ for all distinct $x, y \in [n]$). Without loss of generality, assume $(p, y) \in Q$ for all $y \in [n] \setminus \{p\}$ by adding dummy queries. So A knows that

$$\sum_{y \in [n]} d_1(p, y) = n - 1. \quad (32)$$

Furthermore, assume that A never queries for the distance from a point to itself.

In the sequel, consider the case that $|Q| < \epsilon \cdot (n - 1)^2/4$. By the averaging argument, there exists a point $\hat{p} \in [n] \setminus \{p\}$ involved in at most $2 \cdot |Q|/(n - 1)$

queries in Q . Clearly, A cannot exclude the possibility that $d_1(\hat{p}, y) = 1/2$ for all $y \in [n] \setminus \{\hat{p}\}$ satisfying $(\hat{p}, y) \notin Q$. In summary, A cannot rule out the case that

$$\sum_{y \in [n]} d_1(\hat{p}, y) \leq \frac{2 \cdot |Q|}{n-1} \cdot 1 + \left(n-1 - \frac{2 \cdot |Q|}{n-1}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{2} < \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{4}\right) \cdot (n-1). \quad (33)$$

Equations (32)–(33) contradict the guarantee that p is $(2 - \epsilon)$ -approximate. In summary, any randomized algorithm that always outputs a $(2 - \epsilon)$ -approximate 1-median must *always* make at least $\epsilon \cdot (n-1)^2/4 = \Omega(\epsilon n^2)$ queries given oracle access to the discrete metric.

A Analyzing MAX SQUARE SUM

MAX SQUARE SUM has an optimal solution, denoted $\{\tilde{d}_{u,v} \in \mathbb{R}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)}$, because its feasible solutions (i.e., those satisfying constraints (21)–(22)) form a closed and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2}$. (Recall from elementary mathematical analysis that a continuous real-valued function on a closed and bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^k$ has a maximum value, where $k < \infty$.) Note that $\{\tilde{d}_{u,v} \in \mathbb{R}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)}$ must be feasible to MAX SQUARE SUM. Below is a consequence of constraint (21).

Lemma A.1.

$$\left| \left\{ (u, v) \in B^2(z, \delta nr) \mid \tilde{d}_{u,v} = 2\delta nr \right\} \right| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2 r'}{2\delta nr} \right\rfloor. \quad (34)$$

Proof. Clearly,

$$|B(z, \delta nr)|^2 r' \stackrel{(21)}{=} \sum_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)} \tilde{d}_{u,v} \geq \left| \left\{ (u, v) \in B^2(z, \delta nr) \mid \tilde{d}_{u,v} = 2\delta nr \right\} \right| \cdot 2\delta nr.$$

Furthermore, the left-hand side of inequality (34) is an integer. $\square$

Lemma A.2.

$$\left| \left\{ (u, v) \in B^2(z, \delta nr) \mid \tilde{d}_{u,v} > 0 \right\} \right| \leq \left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2 r'}{2\delta nr} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

Proof. Assume otherwise. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left\{ (u, v) \in B^2(z, \delta nr) \mid \left(\tilde{d}_{u,v} > 0 \right) \wedge \left(\tilde{d}_{u,v} \neq 2\delta nr \right) \right\} \right| \\ & \geq \left| \left\{ (u, v) \in B^2(z, \delta nr) \mid \tilde{d}_{u,v} > 0 \right\} \right| - \left| \left\{ (u, v) \in B^2(z, \delta nr) \mid \tilde{d}_{u,v} = 2\delta nr \right\} \right| \\ & \geq \left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2 r'}{2\delta nr} \right\rfloor + 2 - \left| \left\{ (u, v) \in B^2(z, \delta nr) \mid \tilde{d}_{u,v} = 2\delta nr \right\} \right| \\ & \stackrel{\text{Lemma A.1}}{\geq} 2. \end{aligned}$$

So by constraint (22) (and the feasibility of $\{\tilde{d}_{u,v}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)}$ to MAX SQUARE SUM),

$$\left| \left\{ (u, v) \in B^2(z, \delta nr) \mid 0 < \tilde{d}_{u,v} < 2\delta nr \right\} \right| \geq 2.$$

Consequently, there exist distinct $(x, y), (x', y') \in B^2(z, \delta nr)$ satisfying

$$0 < \tilde{d}_{x,y}, \tilde{d}_{x',y'} < 2\delta nr. \quad (35)$$

By symmetry, assume $\tilde{d}_{x,y} \geq \tilde{d}_{x',y'}$. By inequality (35), there exists a small real number $\beta > 0$ such that increasing $\tilde{d}_{x,y}$ by β and simultaneously decreasing $\tilde{d}_{x',y'}$ by β will preserve constraints (21)–(22). I.e., the solution $\{\hat{d}_{u,v} \in \mathbb{R}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)}$ defined below is feasible to MAX SQUARE SUM:

$$\hat{d}_{u,v} = \begin{cases} \tilde{d}_{x,y} + \beta, & \text{if } (u, v) = (x, y), \\ \tilde{d}_{x',y'} - \beta, & \text{if } (u, v) = (x', y'), \\ \tilde{d}_{u,v}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

Clearly, objective (20) w.r.t. $\{\hat{d}_{u,v}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)}$ exceeds that w.r.t. $\{\tilde{d}_{u,v}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[\frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right] \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)} (\hat{d}_{u,v}^2 - \tilde{d}_{u,v}^2) \\ \stackrel{(36)}{=} & \left[\frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right] \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \\ & \cdot \left((\tilde{d}_{x,y} + \beta)^2 + (\tilde{d}_{x',y'} - \beta)^2 - \tilde{d}_{x,y}^2 - \tilde{d}_{x',y'}^2 \right) \\ = & \left[\frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right] \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot (2\beta\tilde{d}_{x,y} - 2\beta\tilde{d}_{x',y'} + 2\beta^2) \\ > & 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality holds because $\tilde{d}_{x,y} \geq \tilde{d}_{x',y'}$ and $\beta > 0$.

In summary, $\{\hat{d}_{u,v}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)}$ is a feasible solution achieving a greater objective (20) than the optimal solution $\{\tilde{d}_{u,v}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)}$ does, a contradiction. $\square$

We now bound the optimal value of MAX SQUARE SUM.

Theorem A.3. *The optimal value of MAX SQUARE SUM is at most*

$$\left[\frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right] \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \left(\left\lceil \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|^2 r'}{2\delta nr} \right\rceil + 1 \right) \cdot (2\delta nr)^2$$

Proof. W.r.t. the optimal (and thus feasible) solution $\{\tilde{d}_{u,v}\}_{u,v \in B(z, \epsilon nr)}$, objective (20) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)} \chi \left[\tilde{d}_{u,v} \neq 0 \right] \cdot \tilde{d}_{u,v}^2 \\ \stackrel{(22)}{\leq} & \left\lfloor \frac{|B(z, \delta nr)|}{2} \right\rfloor \cdot \frac{1}{|B(z, \delta nr)| \cdot (|B(z, \delta nr)| - 1)} \cdot \sum_{u,v \in B(z, \delta nr)} \chi \left[\tilde{d}_{u,v} > 0 \right] \cdot (2\delta nr)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\chi[P] = 1$ if P is true and $\chi[P] = 0$ otherwise, for any predicate P . Now invoke Lemma A.2. $\square$

References

- [1] C.-L. Chang. Deterministic sublinear-time approximations for metric 1-median selection. *Information Processing Letters*, 113(8):288–292, 2013.
- [2] C.-L. Chang. A deterministic sublinear-time nonadaptive algorithm for metric 1-median selection. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 602:149–157, 2015.
- [3] C.-L. Chang. Metric 1-median selection: Query complexity vs. approximation ratio. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, pages 131–142, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam, 2016. Full version at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.05662>.
- [4] C.-L. Chang. A lower bound for metric 1-median selection. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 84:44–51, 2017.
- [5] D. Eppstein and J. Wang. Fast approximation of centrality. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications*, 8(1):39–45, 2004.
- [6] O. Goldreich and D. Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008.
- [7] S. Guha, A. Meyerson, N. Mishra, R. Motwani, and L. O’Callaghan. Clustering data streams: Theory and practice. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 15(3):515–528, 2003.
- [8] P. Indyk. Sublinear time algorithms for metric space problems. In *Proceedings of the 31st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 428–434, 1999.
- [9] P. Indyk. *High-dimensional computational geometry*. PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2000.

- [10] A. Kumar, Y. Sabharwal, and S. Sen. Linear-time approximation schemes for clustering problems in any dimensions. *Journal of the ACM*, 57(2):5, 2010.
- [11] R. R. Mettu and C. G. Plaxton. Optimal time bounds for approximate clustering. *Machine Learning*, 56(1–3):35–60, 2004.
- [12] R. Motwani and P. Raghavan. *Randomized Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1995.
- [13] W. Rudin. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. McGraw-Hill, 3rd edition, 1976.
- [14] S. Wasserman and K. Faust. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [15] B.-Y. Wu. On approximating metric 1-median in sublinear time. *Information Processing Letters*, 114(4):163–166, 2014.